

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action and the Advisory Action. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejects under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-13, 16-17, and 19 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,344 to Carleton ("*Carleton*") and U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0063583 to Padovani et al. ("*Padovani*"); Claims 5 and 14 as being unpatentable over *Carleton* and U.S. Patent No. 6,218,896 to Becker et al. ("*Becker*"); Claims 6 and 15 as being unpatentable over *Carleton*, *Padovani*, and U.S. Patent No. 6,499,008 to Miet ("*Miet*"); and Claims 9 and 18 as being unpatentable over *Carleton*, *Padovani*, and U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0086070 to Sachse et al. ("*Sachse*"); and Claim 20 as being unpatentable over *Carleton*, *Padovani*, *Becker*, *Miet*, and *Sachse*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of references proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest elements specifically recited in Applicants' claims. For example, the *Carleton-Padovani* combination proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following recited in independent Claim 1:

receiving a signal at an offset estimator, the signal conveying a plurality of symbols in a plurality of packets, a packet having a preamble comprising plurality of preamble symbols;

zero-padding the received signal in a time domain of the received signal with a plurality of zero-valued samples to yield a zero-padded signal, the number of the zero-valued samples calculated from a difference between the number of a plurality of Fourier transform bins and the number of the preamble symbols.

The Examiner relies on Figures 4E, 4F, and 4G and paragraphs 0124 and 0126 of *Padovani* to teach a previous version of Claim 1. (Final Office Action, p. 3.) Paragraph 0124 of *Padovani* merely discloses padding unused octets of a data frame with zeros:

In the exemplary embodiment, the forward link supports two data packet formats which are illustrated in FIGS. 4E and 4F. ... Packet format

410 is used when the data packet to be transmitted to mobile station 6 contains enough data to completely fill all available octets in DATA field 418. If the amount of data to be transmitted is less than the available octets in DATA field 418, packet format 430 is used. The *unused octets are padded with all zeros and designated as PADDING field 446.*

(*Padovani*, ¶ 0124, emphasis added.) Paragraph 0126 merely discloses a frame format field 414 or 434, different from the PADDING field 446, that indicates the frame format of the data frame:

In the exemplary embodiment, frame format (FMT) fields 414 and 434 contain one control bit which indicates whether the data frame contains only data octets (packet format 410) or data and padding octets and zero or more messages (packet format 430). In the exemplary embodiment, a low value for FMT field 414 corresponds to packet format 410. Alternatively, a high value for FMT field 434 corresponds to packet format 430.

(*Padovani*, ¶ 0126.)

That is, *Padovani* merely discloses padding unused octets of a data frame with zeros, and a frame format field 414 or 434, different from the PADDING field 446, that indicates the frame format of the data frame. *Padovani* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “the number of the zero-valued samples calculated from a difference between the number of a plurality of Fourier transform bins and the number of the preamble symbols” of Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 10 and 19-20 and their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-20.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

Correspondence Address:

Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6494
Date: February 6, 2008

Customer Number: 45507